

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/660,997	10/660,997 09/12/2003		David J. Ecker	IBIS0063-100/DIBIS-0002US 7707			
34138	34138 7590 03/13/2006			EXAMINER			
COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C. 1900 MARKET STREET				FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN			
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1637			

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No. App		pplicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/660,997	ECKE	ECKER ET AL.				
			Examiner	Art Un	it				
			Jeffrey Fredman	1637					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appe	ears on the cover she	et with the correspo	ondence ad	Idress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any i	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINISTORY OF THE MI	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.136 nunication. atutory period will will, by statute, of	TE OF THIS COMM 6(a). In no event, however, n Il apply and will expire SIX (6 cause the application to beco	UNICATION. hay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing me ABANDONED (35 U.S	g date of this c				
Status									
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on							
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=	,—								
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the a	pplication.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> are subject to restriction	on and/or el	ection requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a)∏ acce	pted or b)⊡ objecte	d to by the Examin	er.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the d	rawing(s) be held in at	eyance. See 37 CFf	₹ 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).									
۵ _{/۱}	a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage									
	application from the Internatio	•	•			•			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			view Summary (PTO-41					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or			r No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Patent App		O-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date	r (U/30/00)	· —	:·		- ·,			

Application/Control Number: 10/660,997 Page 2

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-13, 23-28, drawn to methods of bioagent identification, particularly for tracking biowarfare situations, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claims 14-22, drawn to genotyping a bioagent, classified in class 435, subclass 91.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions in Group I and in Group II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions are not obvious variants since the bioagent identification methods are drawn to methods involved in tracking and identifying bioagents while the genotyping methods are involved in determining the SNPs or other variations within the specific sequence of interest. Thus, the goals and effects of the methods are different and there is no relationship between the two methods.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Further, the

search for the methods and the art applied may differ since a search for Group I will require consideration of the preamble limitation of terrorism and biowarfare while the Group II method will have to address genotyping methods. There is a significant difference in the prior art that would be applied to the two groups, since PCR methods used in forensic identification would be applicable to Group I but not Group II, for example, while SSCP methods might apply to Group II but not Group I.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

Application/Control Number: 10/660,997 Page 4

Art Unit: 1637

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is (571)272-0742. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571)272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey Fredman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1637

3 (8/06